



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/980,329	03/05/2002		Alan A. Winder	41482/205543	9927
30559	7590	07/08/2004		EXAMINER	
CHIEF PAT			SMITH, RUTH S		
SMITH & N	,			APTADUT	DARED MINARED
1450 BROO	KS ROAI)		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MEMPHIS,	HIS, TN 38116			3737	
				DATE MAILED: 07/08/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/980,329	WINDER ET AL.	W				
,	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ruth S Smith	3737					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	oly to a cation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•	terially reducing or	simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	ction(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely file	d amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)□ will not be entered or brould be rejected is provided bel	o) will be entered low or appended.	and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		_	1				
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	July Ind					

Ruth S Smith Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3737

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not directed to the claimed limitations. The term "therapy" does not exclude tissue destruction. The claims fail to limit the invention to accelerating a healing process.